| Approved For Rele | ease 2000/08/23. | · CIA-RDP65B/ | 00383B00030 | 0120002-1 |
|--------------------|------------------|---------------|------------------------|--|
| WANT OXER I OF DER | このうで、たいいいいいんか | | リリンは やきべい いたねらず | A STATE OF THE STA |

SECRE

D. I. How many plantes and what types all the Cobess have prior to the Bay of Pigs !

A. 1. The Cubene had the following combat aircraft on D-3, the day before the first air strike which occurred on D-2.

Piston Fighters

7 47 7 51 1 1

Subtotal 18

Jet Trainer (Flehters

T-33

Light Bombers

B 26 13

A. S. W.

TBM-12

Subtotal 24

Total 44

Of the above total, it was estimated that some 18 or 19 were flyable. The decements supporting this estimate have not been located, but the following breakdown is believed to be substantially accurate:

Piston Fighters

Sea Fary

6 os 7

Jet Trainers (Fighter)

T 33

6 oz 7

Light Bombers

B 24

. . . .

SECRET

- 2 -

- Q. 2. How many planes and what types were destroyed by the first strike?
- A. 2. It is known that at the most the Cubans employed 7 aircraft against the invasion force: 2 - Sea Fury's, 3 - T 33's and 2 B 26's. There is evidence that on D Day morning the Cubans only had two T 33's flyable, but were able to put a third T 33 in commission during the course of the action. The Sea Fury's and the B 26's were lost the first day, and the Cubans, therefore, were left with only the T 33's. In order to answer the question, it would be necessary to know how accurate the estimate of flyable aircraft on D-3 was. It is believed that it was quite accurate, since the estimate post the D-2 strike was that at the most the CubaneAir Force had left 8 or 9 flyable aircraft of the three types which, in fact, were flown. It will be remembered that after the D-2 strike, the Cubans moved all their flyable combat aircraft from two of the three fields attacked on that morning (i.e., Campo Libertad and Santiago de Cuba) and consolidated them on the third field (i.e., San Antenio de les Banos). Consequently, in addition to photography, there was some check on flyable numbers through intercepts of ground to air communications.
- Q. 3. How many and what types were engaged in repulsing the Bay of Pigs assault?
- A. 3. This question is answered above. It might be noted that allthe aircraft were never used at one time, but flew in and out of the beachhead, which was very simple due to the short distance from the airfield involved. This procedure, however, could have caused some confusion on the high side as to the actual numbers used.
- Q. 4. Secretary Rusk remembered semething about one MIG doing battle. He has two questions about this: (a) Was there such a report; and (b) Was it confirmed if there was such a report?
- A. 4. There were several reports that the Cuban Air Force was using MIG aircraft, but no confirmation of any sort was ever obtained, and it is substantially certain that they did not do so. In this connection, it might be said that the Cuban Air Force, in fact, used fewer aircraft than anticipated, and flew no unexpected type of aircraft except that there was some doubt prior to the action as to whether or not the Tist trainers were armed. In this connection however, it should be noted that the Task Force pilets were briefed to destroy T 33 aircraft on their strike on the armod.

E

| TO 25X17 1 7 E 3 4 5 6 ACTION APPROVAL COMMENT CONCURRE Remarks: | OFFICIA NAME AND A | DIRECT REPLY DISPATCH FILE INFORMATION | DATE | |
|--|---|--|---|-----------------------------------|
| 7 E 3 4 5 6 ACTION APPROVAL COMMENT CONCURRE Remarks: | OFFICIA NAME AND A | DIRECT REPLY DISPATCH FILE | PREPARI RECOMM | E REPLY MENDATION |
| 7 E 3 4 5 6 ACTION APPROVAL COMMENT CONCURRE Remarks: | NAME AND A | DIRECT REPLY DISPATCH FILE | PREPARI RECOMM | E REPLY MENDATION |
| 7 E 3 4 5 6 ACTION APPROVAL COMMENT CONCURRE Remarks: | 12 | DIRECT REPLY DISPATCH FILE | PREPARI RECOMM RETURN | E REPLY MENDATION |
| 7 E 3 4 5 6 ACTION APPROVAL COMMENT CONCURRE Remarks: | | DISPATCH FILE | RECOMM RETURN | E REPLY MENDATION |
| 2 3 4 5 6 ACTION APPROVAL COMMENT CONCURRE Remarks: | | DISPATCH FILE | RECOMM RETURN | MENDATION |
| 4 5 6 ACTION APPROVAL COMMENT CONCURRE Remarks: | NCE | DISPATCH FILE | RECOMM RETURN | MENDATION |
| 5 ACTION APPROVAL COMMENT CONCURRE Remarks: | NCE | DISPATCH FILE | RECOMM RETURN | MENDATION |
| ACTION APPROVAL COMMENT CONCURRE Remarks: | NCE | DISPATCH FILE | RECOMM RETURN | MENDATION |
| ACTION APPROVAL COMMENT CONCURRE Remarks: | NCE | DISPATCH FILE | RECOMM RETURN | MENDATION |
| APPROVAL COMMENT CONCURRE Remarks: | INCE | DISPATCH FILE | RECOMM RETURN | MENDATION |
| COMMENT CONCURRE Remarks: | NCE | FILE | RETURN | |
| CONCURRE Remarks: | NCE | | | |
| Remarks: | INGE | INFURMATION | SIGNATO | UKE |
| to the had as been s said h | ponse to S four ques ked. To sent to the would li | t the DD/P (Estate's requestions which Smy knowledge Committee ake to have the | st for the Secretary e nothing and Joe S | answer Rusk has yet cott |
| meir | final prese 25X1A | | | |
| | FOLD HER | E TO RETURN TO | SENDER | |
| FRO | OM: NAME, ADI | DRESS AND PHONE N | 10. | DATE |
| OGC/I ed For Rele | LC - 7 D (ase 2000/08 | 07 723 : CIA-RDP65 CONFIDEN | 5B00383R0 | 00205f80 |